

Appl. No. 10/694,783  
Amendment dated: July 29, 2006  
Reply to OA of: February 1, 2006

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have amended the claims to more particularly define the invention in view of the outstanding Official Action. It is noted that claim 33 has not been rejected over the prior art or on formal grounds. While Applicants believe that all of the claims present in the application are patentable and allowable over the prior art, the application has been restricted to the subject matter of claim 33 thereby obviating all of the outstanding rejections and placing the application in immediate condition for allowance.

More particularly, all of the claims have been canceled from the application without prejudice or disclaimer and a new set of claims added. New claim 36 is claim 33 written in independent form. That is, it is a combination of dependent claim 33 and claim 30 on which claim 33 depends. Claim 39 contains all of the limitations of claim 33 and an additional step and therefore is equally free of the prior art. The remaining claims are either dependent on claims 36 or claim 39 and are equally allowable and are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. The claims now remaining in the application are claims 36 to 47. Applicants most respectfully submit that all of the claims now present in the application are in full compliance with 35 USC 112 and clearly patentable over the references of record.

The rejection of claims 1-3 as being unpatentable under obviousness-type double patenting over Barnes (6,068,789) in view of DeCrosta et al. (5,550,221) has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims.

The rejection of claims 1-3 as being unpatentable under obviousness-type double patenting over Barnes (6,241,828) in view of DeCrosta et al. been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims.

The rejection of claims 1-7, 12, 13, 18-22, 29-32 and 35 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated over DeCrosta et al. has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims.

Appl. No. 10/694,783  
Amendment dated: July 29, 2006  
Reply to OA of: February 1, 2006

The rejection of claims 8, 9 and 14-17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeCrosta in view of Thomas et al. (6,234,362) has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims.


The rejection of claims 10 and 11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeCrosta in view of Barnes ('828) has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims.

The rejection of claims 23-28 and 34 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeCrosta in view of Cripps (PGPUBS US2003/0180228) has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims.

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the specification and claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By:   
Richard E. Fichter  
Registration No. 26,382

625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Phone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080  
REF/cjw  
A01.wpd  
July 29, 2006